

ED 025 005

By- Briner, Conrad

Organization for Educational Problem Solving.

Pub Date 9 Oct 68

Note- 18p; Paper presented to the National Association of State Boards of Education (Salt Lake City, Utah, October 9, 1968).

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.00

Descriptors- *Administrative Organization, *Educational Administration, Educational Change, *Educational Planning, Educational Problems, Policy Formation, Problem Solving, *State Departments of Education, *State School District Relationship

For education to be maximally effective at the local level, longrange planning must be developed at the State level and a constructive exchange of information concerning educational problems must be operating throughout all levels of a State educational system. Administration of education at the State level must be organized to insure that seven major functions are effectively carried out: (1) Sensing emerging needs for educational development in the State and for related changes in the State's educational system, (2) assigning priorities and allocating resources, (3) designing new educational programs and services, (4) evaluating both new and established educational programs and services, (5) disseminating information regarding new programs, (6) encouraging and supporting the adoption of new and approved instructional programs and services, and (7) assuring the quality of educational offerings in accordance with legislative mandates and State board regulations. A new organic system for State-level administration is described, incorporating an administrative axis and a major program axis. A related document is ED 018 845. (JK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

ORGANIZATION FOR EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM SOLVING

Conrad Briner, Professor of Education
Claremont Graduate School

ED025005

(An address presented to the
National Association of State Boards of Education, Salt Lake City
October 9, 1968)

ED025005

A startling characteristic of the environment within which schools exist today is impulse for change in education. This is a popular impulse in that many people see it, speak for it, and worry about it. On the other hand the decision-making and functional response machinery in most states is static (not alive with activity), rusty (does not work smoothly), or clogged by matters irrelevant to contemporary educational problems and opportunities. Some of us have had the chance recently of observing and working with state-level mechanisms for education problem solving. My purpose here is to report to you some of the key conclusions we have drawn from our field studies, to offer conceptual characteristics of organizational reform, and to suggest specific recommendations state boards might entertain in regard to developing further state-level organization and administration in education. But first, a brief word about environmental impulses.

EA 001 754

The impulse is a wild mix of forces. It is expressed by the civil rights movement, the activities of minority group forces; these

are noisy forces acting upon education. There is concern for cost of education and appropriateness of revenue sources. Popular government is returning to educational administration. Popular information about education is an enlarging phenomenon. The political attractiveness of educational issues as expressed by active politics in education is placing the educational system in some competition with the general political system in each state. Federal government activity is well known to us. The effects of urban coalitions upon education is yet to be understood, but there will be some effect, no doubt. Regional expressions of educational government such as the Education Commission of the States will probably become dynamic forces in the establishing of educational policy. Teacher and administrator organizations are tending to represent forceful establishment biases usually expressed as conservative value positions. The enlarging movement to decentralize administrative services in school districts is, of course, a response to the popular government impulse in education. Assessment of the quality of educational programs is becoming more common and understood as a necessary local and state function in determining policy priority, revenue demands, and the appropriateness of resource allocation. Analysis of these forces and the response machinery of policy making and administration in a number of states prompt ten conclusions.

A first key conclusion is that there is need for close collaboration between local district administration and state-level policy making. This is an obvious conclusion but yet it must be emphasized because of the extent that little partnership--little local/state partnership--exists. Actually the administrative system for education in most states is fragmented, and the participation of the various parts of the system in decision making is a variable difficult to predict. In some states the state-level administrative mechanism appears to be in competition with many local school districts. In talking with people at various levels of educational government we realize that there is little sense of system covering the state, and as a result there is little careful planning involved in developing education programs. The various units within the system are afraid of intelligence information. They are unwilling to report qualitative judgments of teaching and learning. Governmental agencies at the state level, school administrator offices, school boards, tend to react more defensively about educational problems and opportunities than as advocates of adaptation and responsiveness on behalf of educational change. Avenues of communication and decision making that reach into communities to reveal concerns, proposals, interests, of parents and others, actually don't exist. Members of the larger and local communities are not being regarded as sources of ideas and proposals for developing education. At the state level there is little

means of being sensitive to the need for policy interpretation because of changing times, e.g., attention to poverty, cultural deprivation, bilingualism, vocational or career education. There is little effort being generated to renew state-level organization to effect restructuring of educational programs within the state. Instead the mechanisms that do exist are more involved in amending what is already occurring, adding on new programs without regard for the need for modifying that which already exists. This first conclusion is significant also as it portends other conclusions.

Conclusion 2: Opportunities and problems in education are emerging in a rapidly accelerating rate and are having an unprecedented impact on administration, e.g., the need to desegregate schools, incorporate major curriculum developments, assure zero failure performance in schools, accommodate teacher specialization.

Conclusion 3: The actions and leadership potentially available to deal with the opportunities and problems in education are fragmented and uncoordinated, particularly at the state level, e.g., communication across the parts is difficult.

Conclusion 4: Although the resources in some states are great, most states cannot meet all educational opportunities equally, e.g., need for planning and setting priorities according to limited resources.

Conclusion 5: Developments of major significance in education require resources of talent and money beyond the means of local districts, i.e., state-level direction and financing.

Conclusion 6: At all levels of educational administration there is need for a formal process to provide plans for educational development; planning is the neglected art, at least as it involves evaluation and future direction.

Conclusion 7: The state board of education is logically and should be legally in a position to initiate and lead state-level developmental planning for education--a board of directors for the state school system; legislatures are the trustees and local boards interpret state policy according to local conditions.

Conclusion 8: The state department of education as a staff and administrative agency of the state board of education has a vital role to play in the state-level planning process. It should possess at least a capacity to serve as an information center, to generate assessment and policy recommendations, and to monitor the implementation of policy.

Conclusion 9: The tradition of self-responsibility for professional development among teachers and administrators is proving inadequate as a means of assuring up-to-date competency.

Conclusion 10: Planning requires information and our field studies prompt us to conclude that good information, especially

research-based information, is still difficult to find in the functioning of educational systems.

I was recently a part of a study conducted by the Arthur D. Little, Inc., research and management development firm, for the California State Board of Education. The final report of this study is entitled, "A New Organizational System for State-level Educational Administration." In this report, published in 1967, we attempted a conceptual response to the environmental impulse and conclusions of the type I have just mentioned. I draw upon this report somewhat to offer to you now concepts and recommendations for state-level organization in education that probably can be applied in each state. It is fair to say that state-level educational administration is some years behind the state-of-the-art in administration.

The state-level system of educational administration must be organized so as to ensure that seven major functions are effectively carried out:

- (1) Sensing emerging needs for educational development in the state and for related changes in the state's educational system. This sensing function requires: (a) evaluative instruments and capabilities to detect or diagnose the nature, extent, and ideology of problems; (b) knowledge (information) regarding approved conditions, results, and practices; and (c) effective cooperation and communication

among the parties in interest so that required information and the appropriate human and material resources can be mobilized in analyzing needs and suggesting courses of action.

(2) Assigning priorities and allocating resources among areas of discovered need in the context of comprehensive and integrated state plans for education.

The state department is primarily responsible for collecting and interpreting data regarding emerging educational needs and opportunities. These data will continue to come from national and regional levels but will increasingly come from local districts and intermediate units as their capabilities are developed and strengthened. The department recommends priorities and possible strategies for action to the state board. Strategies recommended to the board should include alternative suggestions for programs and projects planned to achieve defined objectives within its specified budgets in the context of a long-range plan. The board reviews and further interprets the department's conclusions and recommendations in the light of its own values and other information available to it. It sets policy within the limits prescribed by the legislature, assigns priorities, adopts plans, and allocates resources within its prerogative. It makes and justifies recommendations to the legislature regarding ultimate policy planning, appropriations, and other necessary legislation.

In most states if these two critically important major functions are to be carried out effectively, three instruments are required: (a) a long-range master plan for public education in the state, (b) a comprehensive annual report of recent educational activities undertaken by the state, and (c) a state plan for specific actions to be taken in the immediate future.

The long-range master plans should enunciate the educational philosophy of the state board, define the long-range educational goals of the board, and recommend and justify their adoption by the legislature as the educational goals of the state. Priorities for action should be indicated and justified. Strategic plans for achieving defined goals should be developed and represented in the master plan. The time frame considered in the master plan could be at least ten years. The long-range master plan should be periodically up-dated and revised as conditions change, new problems and opportunities arise, goals are achieved, and as the board's perception of the state's educational needs changes.

The comprehensive annual report should represent to the people of the state results of the stewardship of the state board of education and the department in the last year. It should report on specific current educational needs of the state, the programs and activities which were or are being carried out to meet those needs, the results of very recent efforts, and the scope and nature of

requirements as yet unmet. It should indicate the progress, or lack of it, made toward achieving the long-range educational goals defined in the master plan and the short-term objectives defined in the more detailed state plan.

The state plan for education should be up-dated and issued annually. It should build on the information developed and presented in the recent annual reports, and it should be directed toward the achievement of long-range goals articulated in the master plan. It should define short-term objectives and their priorities and it should describe the plans for achieving them. Programs and budgets should be planned in considerable detail and justified to the legislature and other governmental agencies. The departmental budget should be based on envisioned programs and activities that should be incorporated in the state plan and supported by the state board.

Such instruments of planning and decision, if carefully developed and widely distributed, could be extremely useful in mobilizing public interest in support of education. They would provide a more meaningful context in which local districts and their many units could plan, and they would serve as a vehicle for involving various publics or parties interested in collaborative educational planning efforts. These tools should prove useful in focusing necessarily limited state resources on the more significant problems

and areas of opportunity and should assist in minimizing the waste of resources through scattered, poorly integrated, and under-financed efforts. In particular, such instruments would provide a more systematic means for identifying requirements and for justifying proposals to a variety of governmental agencies important to education, including the governor and the legislature and its various committees and staff agencies. Also interested would be the U. S. Office of Education.

(3) Providing for the design of new instructional programs and services and the stimulation and support of new educational development to meet discovered needs.

The initial development of major comprehensive curriculum revisions and reconstruction probably will continue to be financed and managed by agencies other than the state. The state board, though, in conjunction with regional educational laboratories, and by means of ad hoc task forces and study groups, should investigate the appropriateness of possible new curricula, minimum standards for instructional programs, criteria for courses of study, and textbooks; and the board adopts or recommends those which appear to meet educational needs of the state. It is imperative that teachers and other groups of professional educators be significantly involved in such investigations and deliberations.

(4) Evaluating both new and established educational programs and services, the way in which such programs and services are planned and administered, and requirements for redirecting allocations of human and material resources.

Increasing emphasis is being placed on evaluation by a number of agencies financing or adopting new educational developments. It is a state-level responsibility to see that this major function is effectively carried out. However, evaluations actually may be carried out by the local districts or a consortium of districts by one or more intermediate units, by ad hoc task forces or units at various levels and locations in the state department of education. Or in special cases by agencies and groups outside the department on contract to the state board or the department.

Educational programs and services should be designed to achieve specific objectives related to established priorities. It is important that evaluation studies be carried out not only for the purpose of measuring results and comparing relative efficacy in serving priority needs but also to appraise the effectiveness of administration and the appropriateness of allocations of talents and funds.

(5) Facilitating the dissemination of information regarding new instructional programs and services and their effects.

Responsibility for carrying out this function is shared

among the local districts, intermediate unit and state levels of administration. Important information is also being generated by universities, foundations, regional educational centers and laboratories, supplemental educational centers, and other agencies. Data on the results of experimentation and for various evaluation studies must be reported, collected, interpreted, and effectively distributed to all appropriate parties.

(6) Encouraging and supporting the adoption of new educational developments and approved instructional programs and services.

A process vital to the function of providing state-level encouragement and support is that of exercising leadership. I do not mean leadership in the nebulous sense. I refer instead to the interpersonal and professional influences that state board members and department personnel bring to bear on other individuals and parties that result in constructive action; that is, getting things done which are truly important to education in the state. For example, if improved curricula and pedagogical methods are adopted or recommended for the state, comprehensive programs may need to be organized to assist teachers in becoming knowledgeable and competent in the new approaches; new sets of supplementary instructional materials may need to be developed for both pupils and teachers; appropriate financing must be assured for teacher training in the development, production,

and distribution of required materials; and the teacher preparatory institution may need to revise their programs in order to produce new teachers thoroughly grounded in the new approaches. Effecting changes as significant and comprehensive as those mentioned and developing collaboration with all agencies necessary to effect such comprehensive changes requires leadership of the highest order.

(7) Assuring the quality of educational offerings in accordance with legislative mandates and as required by regulations of the state board.

Quality assurance is an important responsibility of educational administration at all levels. The development of instruments and means for collecting information necessary for quality assurance is the responsibility of the state department. The task of monitoring the process of reporting quality assurance information at local levels--that is, assuring the accuracy and validity of reported information--should be delegated to local and intermediate units where appropriate capability exists or, where it is lacking, by department personnel. The state-wide collation, interpretation and reporting of quality assurance information is a major responsibility of the state board and department.

Now, if these functional requirements of state-level educational administration are to be carried out most effectively, a number

of changes probably must be effected in management processes, in organizational relationships and structure, and in the functional capability of state-level organization. In this regard, as an example, we recommended in the Arthur D. Little study of the California State Department of Education a new organic system for state-level administration.

The recommended organizational system has two dimensions or axes. One axis consists of those familiar organizational units known as divisions and offices. We call this the administrative axis. The other axis is comprised of organizational units particularly concerned with broad educational issues or sets of complex problems which require unique and considerable multidisciplinary attention in their treatment. We call this the major program axis.

The compensatory education program in California is useful as an illustration to clarify the concept of major program. It is oriented toward fulfilling the developmental needs of culturally disadvantaged children, a population segment defined (for administrative purposes) by the level of family income and which cuts across the traditional departmental disciplines of preschool, elementary, and secondary education, pupil personnel services, special education, food and health services, school community relations, facility planning, and educational research and evaluation. Its charter is derived from state and federal legislation, it must work cooperatively through

and with intermediate units and local districts, and the several elements in the program are funded through various statutes and acts which require certain criteria to be met before district proposals can be approved and funded. The magnitude of the efforts required and the frustrations involved of organizing an effective state-level agency to administer compensatory education programs are legend in many states. A significant problem was involved in obtaining the required number of staff with appropriate skills, in obtaining space, materials, and equipment. In California the office of compensatory education was established by the McAteer Act of the legislature. The office did not fit neatly into any established division, and it was set up outside the existing divisional structure. It required and still requires the use of skills and capabilities identical with or very similar to those in the present divisions of instruction, special schools and services, public school administration, and also in educational research, vocational education, and data-processing units. There was an urgent need for action since machinery had to be set up expeditiously in order to exploit the opportunities afforded by large but time-limited appropriations of federal funds for serving the educational needs of children of thousands of economically and culturally disadvantaged families in California. Because of unusual dedication and effort on the part of compensatory education administrators and staff and with variable assistance and support from

others, the program was launched and became operative. Adjustments and refinements have been made over time; the organization has jelled and the consensus is that the program is operating well. However, it is functioning not as an integral part of the state department of education, drawing sensitively and flexibly on relevant and potentially valuable skills and services within various divisions and bureaus, but as a relatively independent, quasi-autonomous appendage. It has acquired new kinds of experience, gained new knowledge and developed meticulous skills which could have a salutary effect on the rest of the department and possibly on other educational processes of the state if they could be shared. There is very little interchange of professional personnel, information, experience, and knowledge. This represents lost potential for departmental development. The physical separation of the compensatory education office and people from the main education building is a constraint on such interaction, as is esprit de corps and cohesiveness of the people in the unit who in some measure tend to feel they have demonstrated they can accomplish a great deal more or less on their own and therefore don't need the rest of the department. Obviously they belong in the department as a major program.

The concept of the organic diamond with the program axis cutting across divisional organizational boundaries to form multidisciplinary task-oriented teams encourages and even forces a

broader departmental view of educational issues and problems as opposed to a divisional bureau or particularistic view. It discourages the tendency to take a narrow or parochial view of the department's role, it stresses the need for improved inter-divisional communication and planning, and it requires the application of modern management methods and techniques.

The proposed organic structure provides increased opportunity for much needed professional personnel development. It is possible to allocate only a portion of a person's available time into a single task, thereby allowing him to work on several concurrent tasks. By proper planning an individual can shift from one type of assignment to another of quite different demands so that his job experience is broadened and varied. Training experiences specifically appropriate to the needs of individual professionals should be identified and provided. By working on several programs and projects the individual is able to work for several supervisors and with team members possessing different skills. He can learn from their varied capabilities, thereby adding to his own versatility.

The competition among major program managers and division chiefs for the best staff will cause those persons who perform most successfully to be in much demand, and those who perform poorly to be unsought. This provides important information for use in salary administration, in assigning tasks, and in planning development

experiences for individual staff. In addition, the internal competition for staff with recognized capabilities will require division and bureau chiefs to justify their reluctance to release key staff to important programs by demonstrating how such staff are critical to the achievement of specific objectives related to an established hierarchy of priorities. This is another demonstration of the value of good program planning.

Inherent in this organizational scheme is considerable potential for more flexible and varied use of professional staff. Effective exploitation of this potential requires style of leadership and followership new to most departments. A professional may work for two or three managers on different programs going on at the same time. Organizational myths notwithstanding, it is quite possible. Scientists, researchers, consultants and engineers who work on various development teams or task forces have demonstrated that it can work and to the organizational health and benefit of the enterprise.

A department so constituted in purpose and function would be essential in serving the state board of education and its two interdependent responsibilities, that of policy formation and that of overall management of the state's educational system. Such organization can mean a new vitality for identifying and solving educational problems. It is a truism to say that the state board cannot fulfill adequately its responsibility to the state without the support of such an organization.